

Appl. No. 09/916,543
Amendment and Response to Office Action

Docket No. 85804-013500

REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 22, 2005. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7 to 17, 20 to 77, 79, 80, 82 to 108 and 110 to 124 are the pending claims, of which Claims 1, 11, 16, 24, 29, 31, 75, 107, 108, 111 and 112 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

By the Office Action, the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). More particularly, Claims 1, 16, 29, 75, 107 and 108 are rejected over U.S. Patent No. 6,125,385 (Wies) and U.S. Patent No. 6,337,696 (Lindhorst), Claims 2, 4, 9 to 13, 17, 22 to 26, 30 to 74, 76, 77, 79, 80, 82, 85 to 106 and 110 to 124 are rejected over Wies, Lindhorst, and U.S. Patent No. 5,996,003 (Namikata), Claims 7, 8, 20, 21, 83 and 84 are rejected over Wies, Lindhorst, Namikata and U.S. Patent No. 5,708,780 (Levergood), and Claims 14, 15, 27 and 28 are rejected over Wies, Lindhorst, Namikata and U.S. Patent No. 6,128,649 (Smith). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Turning to the specific language of the claims, Claim 1 recites a method of adding interactive functionality to a web-page. According to the method, a request for the web-page is received from a first user. The requested web-page is retrieved, and script code is embedded within the requested web-page to add interactive functionality to the web-page. The step of embedding the script code is performed absent user editing and comprises parsing the requested web-page to determine an appropriate location to embed script code that is absent from the requested web page prior to the parsing. The requested web-page having the embedded script code is transmitted to the first user.

Claim 1 is being amended to clarify that the step of embedding the script code is performed absent user editing. As recited in Claim 1, script code is embedded in a requested web-pages, and the requested web-page having the embedded script code is transmitted to a

Appl. No. 09/916,543
Amendment and Response to Office Action

Docket No. 85804-013500

requesting user, independent of user editing. The applied art, namely Wies and Lindhorst, fails to disclose each and every one of the claimed features.

The Office Action concedes that Weis fails to disclose or suggest parsing a web-page to determine an appropriate location to embed the script code. In light of the concessions made in the Office Action, Weis cannot be said to disclose or suggest performing the step of embedding script code absent user editing by parsing the web-page to determine an appropriate location to embed the script code. Furthermore and as discussed below, Lindhorst fails to disclose embedding script code within a requested web-page prior to transmitting the web-page to a requesting user, the step of embedding the script code being performed absent user editing by parsing the requested web-page to determine an appropriate location to embed script code that is absent from the requested web-page prior to said parsing.

Lindhorst describes an editing/development environment. Clearly, an environment used for editing is not the same as, independent of user editing, receiving a request for a web-page, retrieving the requested web-page, embedding script code within the requested web-page to add interactive function to the web-page, and transmitting the requested web-page having the embedded script code to the requesting user. Nothing in Lindhorst teaches or suggests performing a step of embedding script code in a requested web-page absent user editing.

The editing/development environment described in Lindhorst builds a graphical user interface in which a user can edit an HTML object/document. After the user finishes making edits, Lindhorst describes rebuilding the HTML document from the user's edits. Nothing in Lindhorst can be read to embed script code a requested web-page absent user editing. Nothing in Lindhorst discloses or suggests an embedding step which is performed absent user editing and comprises parsing a requested web-page to determine an appropriate location to embed script code that is absent from the requested web page prior to said parsing.

Appl. No. 09/916,543
Amendment and Response to Office Action

Docket No. 85804-013500

Accordingly, neither Wies nor Lindhorst, alone or in any permissible combination (if one in fact even exists, a point not conceded by Applicants) teach, suggest or describe each and every one of the elements of the claimed invention.

The cited portions of Namikata have been reviewed and are not seen to remedy the deficiencies noted above.

Claims 1, 11, 16, 24, 29, 31 (and the claims that depend therefrom) are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. In addition, for at least the same reasons, Claims 75, 107, 108, 111 and 112 (and the claims that depend therefrom) are believed to be in condition for allowance.

The other claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance therefore be issued in this case. Should matters remain which the Examiner believes could be resolved in a further telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the Applicant's undersigned attorney.

In this regard, Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached by phone in California (Pacific Standard Time) at (714) 708-6500. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the below-listed address.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fee in connection with the submission of this paper, any additional fees which may be required, now or in the future, or credit any overpayment to Account No. 50-2638. Please ensure that the Attorney Docket


Appl. No. 09/916,543
Amendment and Response to Office Action

Docket No. 85804-013500

Number is referred when charging any payments or credits for this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 24, 2006



Carole A. Quinn
Reg. No. 39,000
Email: quinnmc@gtlaw.com
Phone: (714) 708-6500

Customer Number 32361
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
Met Life Building
200 Park Avenue, 20th Floor
New York, New York 10166
Phone: (212) 801-9200
Fax: (212) 801-6400

ac-fb142954v02

BEST AVAILABLE COPY